Security Classification	**OFFICIAL**
Disclosable under FOIA 2000	**Yes**
Contact/Author	**Tim Dawson**
Telephone/Ext number	**X47248**
Department/Area	**Strategic Development**
Date created	**June 2017**
Chief Officer Approved by	**DCC Knighton**
Attachments: Appendix 1 – Outstanding HMIC Recommendations 2014-2016 *Appendix 2 – Completed HMIC Recommendations 2014-2016*	
Purpose Of Paper: Information	

POLICE AND CRIME STRATEGIC BOARD

MEETING DATE: 15TH JUNE 2017

ITEM NO: 4(D)

TITLE: HMIC AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

1. Summary

(This should give the reader a basic overview of the issues and problems and of the decision to be made)

This report provides an overview of the action being taken by the force in response to areas for improvement and recommendations identified by HMIC following their force level inspections and thematic inspections.

The terms 'recommendation' and 'area for improvement' have different meanings. Areas for improvement (AFIs) are reported in relation to a shortcoming in an aspect of a force's practice, policy or performance, whereas Recommendations are provided to accompany a cause for concern. HMIC have a duty to monitor improvements against causes for concern that they have identified.

The force's progress against areas for improvement and recommendations from 2014 onwards have been reported to HMIC for publication on their website. There will be ongoing activity with the HMI and Force Liaison Lead attached to each Force to keep progress updated in the public forum. It was expected that HMIC would publish each force's progress against AFIs and recommendations in the first quarter of 2017/18, but this has not yet taken place.

Strategic responsibility for delivery of the action required rests with the Deputy Chief Constable.

The Continuous Improvement Unit has consolidated the outstanding HMIC recommendations into a single tracker which is used to drive activity, assess progress and provide assurance that areas for improvement (where agreed) are being delivered within the required timeframe. This tracker provides the Force with "one version of the truth".

Continuing work to monitor and report on the progress of recommendations and AFIs has resulted in a reduction of 4 in 2014, 1 in 2015 and the number for 2016 has increased by 8 as a result of the publication of the force's PEEL Effectiveness report in March 2017.

The report provides a snapshot of the current position at the time of writing, as the tracker is a live document, and as such is being continuously reviewed and updated.

2. Recommendation

(What is the preferred option or course of action recommended? A clear steer is required)

That the report be noted by the Police and Crime Commissioner.

3. Details

(This section should give the detailed appraisal of the issues being considered)

The numbers of AFIs and recommendations still in progress in Force are:

	2014	2015	2016
PEEL	0	0	16 (+8)
Thematic/Specific	5 (-4)	6 (+2)	0 (-1)

3.1 AFIs and Recommendations from 2014

There were previously nine outstanding AFIs and recommendations from 2014. Four relating to Core Policing have now been completed and closed.

This now leaves five outstanding under core policing. Further information regarding the outstanding recommendations is provided at Appendix 1.

2014 recommendations have been reviewed to ensure their continuing relevance to the force, as many originated from the National Core Policing report and therefore are areas for improvement for policing in general, or may not fully represent the current position three years later. The remaining five AFIs are those that continue to be relevant, and the current work that is ongoing is included at Appendix 1. The remaining AFIs are relevant to work being conducted under various improvement programmes including Thoughtful Policing, the Agile Working Programme and the LCSP ASB partnership.

3.2 AFIs and Recommendations from 2015

There were previously four outstanding AFIs and recommendations from thematic inspections. This has now been increased to five as a result of a review by the SRO, who has asked for further evidence regarding three of the recommendations in relation to PEEL Effectiveness (Crime) and PEEL Effectiveness (Vulnerability). Actions have taken place to address the issues raised, but at this stage, there is not enough evidence to provide the SRO with enough confidence to close them. This will be reviewed again and reported on before the next reporting period.

The remaining recommendations from 2015 are in relation to Firearms Licensing and Custody, and more information is provided on the status and progress of each in Appendix 1.

The last JESIP AFI in relation to lessons learned has now been completed and closed (see Appendix 2) as sufficient usage of the Joint Operational Learning (JOL) database has now taken place to evidence its effectiveness as a learning tool.

Firearms Licensing is actively being reviewed in relation to the transformation of processes to ensure a more streamlined and efficient approach. The expected upcoming bulge in demand has been analysed and sufficient resources put into place.

One custody recommendation in relation to the gathering of use of force data remains ongoing. The use of NICHE processes for recording and capturing data is being rolled out. Interim measures, including input at the first and second line supervisors seminar have improved the force's position.

3.3 AFIs and Recommendations from 2016

There are currently sixteen outstanding recommendations from 2016, all relating to the force's annual PEEL inspection. The previously outstanding recommendation from a thematic inspection in relation to missing children has been closed (see Appendix 2).

In relation to Efficiency, the tracker has been updated to reflect the current position of PBB options being considered in relation to the previous AFI.

The PEEL Legitimacy report made a number of AFIs in relation to ethical and lawful behaviour of staff, managing performance and demonstrating to the people it serves regarding how the force has taken action to improve its services. A number of early plans and proposals are in place to address these issues, principally through the Professional Standards Department (PSD). Further detail is provided at Appendix 1.

The Force received a grading of 'Good' overall in the 2016 PEEL Effectiveness Inspection, representing a grading of 'Good' in all areas except Vulnerability, where the force was assessed as 'Requires Improvement'. Three areas for improvement and three recommendations in relation to vulnerability were received.

Detail in relation to the early plans to address the issues underlying the AFIs and recommendations in relation to Effectiveness are included in more detail at Appendix 1, and many represent ongoing improvements as a result of the improved Policing Model or in relation to the Thoughtful Policing Project.

3.4 Recent and upcoming Thematic Inspections

The force was selected as an 'early adopter' for the 2017 PEEL Efficiency and Legitimacy inspection in April 2017. This enabled HMIC to test a new inspection methodology in Lincolnshire and Gwent, in order to better inform the way that this element of PEEL is inspected in all forces in 2017. A Hot Debrief has been received in relation to this inspection, and possible areas of improvement identified, however the methodology and report will change

during the national inspection programme and moderation, and final AFIs and recommendations will not be received until the report is published in the third quarter of 2017/18.

The force has recently hosted an 'insight visit', during which inspectors examined a number of pre-selected files on Niche and NSPIS to provide information to better inform the PEEL Effectiveness Inspection, due to take place at a date to be announced between September and December 2017.

3.5 Closed AFIs and recommendations

All closed AFIs and recommendations for 2014-2016 are included at Appendix 2.

As previously reported, when the tracker was implemented in February 2016, many of the recommendations were reviewed by the Force Executive and the Continuous Improvement Unit for their continued relevance. Many were closed as they were out of date or had been superseded by later recommendations. They have been marked accordingly to reflect that position.

Following that review, the remaining AFIs and recommendations have since been subject to regular updates, and therefore when closed have a greater amount of narrative attached to them.

It is intended to continue providing the closed AFIs and recommendations in this report to provide assurance regarding progress and completion.

4. Financial Implications

(What impact will this have on the financial infrastructure of the force or on individual budgets? Does it involve growth and if so from where will the monies be obtained? Does it involve savings? Has this been quality assured by the Finance Department – state contact's name)

See 3 above and Appendix 1 for detail of investment being made to address issues and reduce risk in relation to HMIC recommendations.

5. People Implications

(What impact will this have on the staffing infrastructure of the force or on individual posts? Does it involve growth, shrinkage or change? Has this been quality assured by the HR Department – state contact's name)

n/a

6. Consultation

(Reassure COG that the key people this affects have been consulted and their views reflected upon)

n/a

7. Communication

(What are the key communication messages and how will they be delivered? Are there any internal or external communication issues and how will they be addressed?)

Communication plans for individual HMIC Force reports are in place with the Corporate Communications Team.

8. Equality & Diversity Impact Assessment

(When developing proposals and making strategy, policy and service decisions, the Force must comply with its statutory equality duties. These are to ensure that decisions are made in such a way to minimise unfairness and do not have a disproportionately negative effect on people due to their race, religion and

belief, disability, gender, transgender, sexual orientation or age as well as to promote equality to all listed groups. This applies equally to service changes impacting on communities resulting from budget cuts, and to any voluntary or compulsory redundancies impacting our workforce. The point at which assessments should be conducted are when they become a "serious consideration".

It would be timely now for Heads of Departments to be considering where EIAs are going to be necessary. The outcomes of the assessments should form part of the decision making process to demonstrate that the impact has been considered, or mitigated as necessary.

Sufficient time needs to be allowed to properly assess service changes although pragmatically we should ensure assessments are not unduly completed unnecessary for proposals that are unlikely to progress. Melanie Cowell, Force Diversity Officer, is available for further advice and help on carrying out impact assessments.)

Recommendation – consider the point at which EIA's should be undertaken by d and identify those changes requiring an assessment

n/a

9. Information Assurance and Management

Please comment on the IA/M issues resulting from the proposal by reference to the attached guide:

n/a